

# Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

SEBASTE, TURKEY IN ASIA, August 10, 1883.

Sir:

Those of your readers who are interested in the exploration of Greek antiquity in the East, are no doubt acquainted with the work in Asia Minor during the past three years, of Mr. W. M. Ramsay, of Oxford. But for the information of those who are not familiar with the archaeological doings of the day, it may be necessary to state that the object of Mr. Ramsay's journeys is to illustrate the history of Asia Minor by a careful and comprehensive study of all the existing remains of antiquity. Accordingly copies and impressions of inscriptions are made, the sculptured monuments are drawn and described, coins of cities are collected as far as feasible, and in short, the aim is to do everything that will in any way illustrate or increase our knowledge of Greek and Roman antiquity in Asia Minor. Last winter in Athens it was, of course, well known in archaeological circles that Mr. Ramsay contemplated an extensive tour in Asia Minor during the present summer, and it was also known to a few that two members of the French school at Athens had a similar archaeological journey in view. Mr. Ramsay was asked to give a minute description of the route he proposed to take, in order that the Frenchmen might traverse a different district and not interfere in the least with the English expedition. In explanation of what follows it is perhaps proper to state that the writer was invited to join the English expedition.

The Frenchmen left Saraikieui, the present terminus of the Ottoman Railway, about ten days before we did. One of the two became ill and returned to Smyrna, leaving M. Paris to continue the journey alone. We had not proceeded far, when we were astonished to find ourselves upon his trail. We could see what he had done, or more properly speaking what he had left undone. We noticed that he left whole series of villages unvisited and unexplored. Even in places he had touched we saw that much had been left undone that might easily have been done with but small expenditure of time and energy. For instance, in one village we copied nine inscriptions which M. Paris had left untouched. This we knew because some digging and adjustment of fragments was necessary in order to read the inscriptions. All this very apparent hurry led us to believe that M. Paris was heading for the eastern country, and took cognizance of things in intermediate districts simply enpassant.

But it appears, as will be seen presently, that this was intended for earnest work in the line of archaeological research. After a time we passed through the villages Sevaslee and Seljikler, in the neighborhood of which the ancient Sebaste was situated, its name being preserved in the modern Sevaslee. Ten days after our visit to these villages the July number of the Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique—the publication of the French school at Athens—came to hand. This July number was published in advance of the May and June

numbers; at least the latter had not yet reached the subscribers in Smyrna. In the July number we found a paper on the inscriptions of Sebaste, by M. Paris. He had brought his short excursion to an abrupt termination and had gone to Smyrna to publish the results of his journey. A glance at his paper sufficed to reveal to us errors in almost all of the inscriptions. We were thoroughly convinced of the accuracy of our readings, but when, in the course of our zigzags, we found ourselves once more in the neighborhood of Sevaslee and Seljikler, it was made convenient for the writer to revisit those villages in order to verify our own readings as well as those of M. Paris. Besides this, impressions of the stones were made, so that the accuracy of the statements which follow may be easily verified. The long inscription published by M. Paris bears the date 99 A. D., and most probably marks an era in the Hellenisation of the city of Sebaste. The γερουσία was a feature of Greek cities, and as the cities of the interior became Hellenized they adopted, among other things, the institution of the γερουσία. So that on the whole it may be safely assumed that the stone was erected in commemoration of the organization of the γερουσία in Sebaste. It may, however, be noted that the interpretation of M. Paris is altogether different.

In lines 1-2, M. Paris reads 'Ασκληπιάδου 'Ερμογένους. It is true that here the stone is much worn, but nevertheless 'Ασκληπιάδου τοῦ Έρμογένους may be easily distinguished. In line 4, M. Paris reads [-]να τοῦ καὶ 'Αντωνίου, but the stone has  $\Pi a\pi \tilde{a}$  τοῦ καὶ 'Αντωνίου. In line 29, col. 1, he reads Μηνόφιλος Βλέπιδος φύσει Εὐπάτορος. It is true that here M. Paris has the correct reading so far as the letters themselves are concerned, if I may except a distinct and unmistakable dot both before and after the B of his word Βλέπιδος. Still that he understands the signification of the letters is a daring assumption. I need scarcely mention that  $M\eta\nu\delta\phi\iota\lambda\rho\varsigma$   $\beta'$  is the short way of indicating that the man in question bore the same name as his father, or in other words it stands in place of Μηνόφιλος Μηνοφίλου. It was usual to write the second name of a man after that of his father, so that the passage under discussion is clearly Μηνόφιλος δὶς Λέπιδος φύσει Εὐπάτορος. In line 31, col. 1, M. Paris reads Ἰλέγων; the stone has  $\phi \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu$ . The down-stroke of the  $\phi$  is bold, while the circular part is quite small, but it is very plain even in the impression. In lines 40-41, M. Paris gives up the contest and reads:

> ' Αλέξανδρος Μελίτωνος ΛΟΝ Διόδωρος Ξανθίππου Γεῖνος.

This apparent difficulty is easily explained. The stonecutter inserted the latter half of the word  $\Lambda ovy \epsilon \bar{\nu} vo \varepsilon$  under the  $\Lambda ON$  in line 41, seeing that the space in line 40 was limited. The -yeavo  $\varepsilon$  is not horizontal, but runs at a small angle upwards, from which it is clear that line 40 must read  $\Lambda \lambda \epsilon \varepsilon av \delta \rho o \varepsilon M \epsilon \lambda \delta \tau \omega vo \varepsilon \Lambda ovy \epsilon \bar{\nu} vo \varepsilon$ .

In line 46, col. 1, M. Paris reads  $\Gamma \epsilon \mu \omega_0 \Delta \delta \delta \omega \nu$ ; the stone has  $\Gamma \epsilon \mu \omega_0 \Delta \delta \delta \omega \nu$ . The name  $\Gamma \epsilon \mu \omega_0$  sounds queer enough, and may be a mistake on the part of the stonecutter for  $\Gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega_0$ , but the M is certain. In lines 41–42, col. 2, M. Paris reads  $\Pi a \pi \bar{a} g \Pi a \kappa \rho i \tau \omega \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$  was Nov $\tau \dot{a} \nu \omega_0$ , and assures us that both his copy and his impression have Nov $\tau \dot{a} \nu \omega_0$ , not Mov $\tau \dot{a} \nu \omega_0$ . This is doubtless true, but the stone and my impression both read unmistakably Mov $\tau \dot{a} \nu \omega_0$ , and just as unmistakably

Μηνοκρίτου instead of the Ίπποκρίτου of M. Paris; that is, Παπᾶς Μηνοκρίτου τοῦ καὶ Μοντάνου.

For the sake of completeness and easy reference the text of the inscription is inserted here.

## 'Αγαθή Τύχη

\*Ετους σπγ ἐπὶ ἰερέων 'Ασκληπιάδου τοῦ 'Ερμογένους καὶ Ξάνθου 'Αρτέμων[ος] οὶ ἰσελθόντες [ε]ἰς τὴν γερουσίαν · Θεογένης Παπὰ τοῦ καὶ 'Αντωνίου, 'Αριστώνις Γλύκωνος, Διόδωρος 'Ιπποδάμου,

C----

5

Μένανδρος Διονυσίου, Παπᾶς Κέλσου,

Διόδωρος Μηνοφίλου,

Διονύσιος 'Αριστέου, 10 'Ηλιᾶς 'Απολλωνίου,

Θεογένης Θεογένους ιατρός,

Ίππόνεικος 'Αρτεμιδώρον,

Διονύσιος Νίγερος, Δάδης 'Αλεξάνδρου,

15 Φίρμιος Πατροκλέους, Μόσχος Ίππονείκου,

Νεικασίων Βύλλωνος,

Ευφραστος Καίσαρος,

Μάρκος Οὐαλέριος Κρίσφος στρατιώτης,

20 'Αθᾶνις 'Απελλᾶ, 'Ερμογένης Νεικασίωνος,

> Κούαρτος 'Απολλωνίου.

Μόσχος Μενάνδρου,

25 Πατροκλής Διοδώρου,

Μόσχος 'Απελλᾶ,

'Ρώμαϊς 'Αππολλωνίου,

Πρωτᾶς 'Αντιφῶντος,

Μηνόφιλος . Β . Λέπιδος 30 φύσει Εὐπάτορος,

Μ. Οὐαλέριος Φλέγων,

\*Ατταλος 'Αρτεμιδώρου,

Γάϊος Οὐαλέριος Λό[ν]γος στρατιώτης,

Μελίτων Κώκου,

35 Σισίνης Μενεστράτου,

Νεικᾶς Τιμοθέου,

Γάϊος Καρβεῖλις Γαίου υίός, Φαβία, Μιθραδάτης,

Δημήτρειος 'Αππᾶ,

40 'Αλέξανδρος Μελίτωνος Λον-

#### COLUMN II.

Διονύσιος Διονυσίου,

'Ασκλᾶς Κέλσου,

Θευδᾶς 'Αριβάζου, Μοσχᾶς Μενεστράτου.

Μενεσθεὺς Θενδᾶ,

' Αλέξανδρος Θευδᾶ,

Απεξανορος Θευσα, Μηνόκριτος Ξάνθου,

Μιηνοκριτός Δανού

\*Ανδρων Διοδώρου,

'Ιππόνικος 'Αντιφῶντος,

'Αλέξανδρος Μενάνδρου,

Γλύκων 'Αριστώνιδος,

'Αντιφῶν Πρωτομάχου,

Γ. 'Ιούλιος Πρόκλος,

Κλανδία Τευθραντίς.

Γ. 'Ιούλιος Πρόκλος υίός.

'Ιουλία 'Ιουλιανὴ θυγάτηρ,

Γ. 'Ιούλιος Πρόκλος Αίλιανός,

Γ. Ἰούλιος Γερμανός,

Mοσχãς 'Aππã,

\*Αντυλλος Φιλοπάτορος,

Διονύσιος Διονν-

σίου Φλαουιανός,

'Ωλος 'Αλφιος 'Απερ,

'Αριστέας Διονυσίου, Κράτης 'Ιπποδάμου,

Νεικομᾶς Σόλωνος,

' $\Lambda$ πελλ $ilde{a}$ ς

 $\Lambda \pi \epsilon \lambda \lambda \tilde{a}$ ,

Εὐμένης 'Απολ-

λωνίου,

COLUMN I.

Διόδωρος Ξανθίππου, -γεῖνος, Παπᾶς 'Αμφικάτου, Μελίτων Μελίτωνος, 'Αλέξανδρος Τειμοθέου, 45 Διόδωρος Τίτου, Γέ[λλ]ιος Λάδων, 'Ιουλία Τευθραν[τίς]

Πρόκλου θυγάτηρ,

Column II. Παπᾶς Μηνοκρίτου τοῦ καὶ Μοντάνου,

'Ανδρέας Μάρκου,

Διόδωρος Πατροκλέους,

There is much doubt and uncertainty about the functions of the priests and priestesses of the Roman Emperors, as well as concerning the date of the institution of the office. Consequently all inscriptions which bear on this interesting point are of great importance, especially if they are dated, as is the case with the following inscription. The date of an inscription is always important, and it is in regard to the date of this inscription that M Paris has sinned grievously. The stone has ETOYS •  $\Sigma\Pi\Theta$  in large and perfectly preserved letters, with an unmistakable dot between the two  $\Sigma$ 's. This makes the date 205 A. D., whereas M. Paris leaves out the  $\Sigma$  of the date and reads  $\Pi\Theta$ , that is, 5 A. D. Thus he misses the truth by a matter of 200 years.

Κατὰ τὰ πολλάκις δόξαντα τῆ βουλῆ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ Μεμμίαν 'Αρίστην Τευθραντίδα ἀρχιέρειαν τῆς 'Ασίας οἱ ἴδιοι θρεπτοὶ παρ' ἐαυτῶν, ἐπιμελησαμένου Κ. Μεμμίου Κύρου τοῦ τροφέως αὐτῆς · ἔτους σπθ', μη(νὸς) ἰα', κ' ·

The inscription is in the wall of the minaret of the mosque. It is noteworthy that on a ground stone of this same minaret there is another inscription, not ten feet distant from the one given above. For this inscription we look in vain in the paper of M. Paris.

In the following inscription M. Paris reads  $\pi o \iota \eta \sigma a \mu \ell \nu \eta \varsigma$  instead of  $\pi \rho o \nu o \eta \sigma a - \mu \ell \nu \eta \varsigma$ . The letters  $\nu o \eta$  are in ligature, so that the  $\nu$  and the  $\eta$  are combined, and above them is a small o; the  $\pi$  and  $\rho$  were also most probably in ligature, although in my copy I find  $\pi$  alone.

### ['Αγα]θῆ τύχη

'Η βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος ἐτείμησεν Κόϊ(ντον) Μέμμιον Χαρίδημον Τεύθραντα, 'Ασίας ἀρχιερέων ἔγγονον, ήρωα, ἄριστον ῥήτορα, τῆς ἀναστάσεως π[ρ]ονοησαμένης Στατειλίας Καλλιγόνης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ' ἔτους τκθ', μη(νὸς) θ'.

Date 245 A. D.

In the following inscription in the yard of the Mussafir Odah of Seljikler, M. Paris wonders at the strange form  $\pi a \nu \tau o \pi \omega \lambda \eta \iota \varsigma$ . Unfortunately the stone has  $\pi a \nu \tau o \pi \omega \lambda \eta \varsigma$  pure and simple.

Not having the Bulletin beside me, I do not know what M. Paris has made of the praenomen in line I. The stone is broken at the commencement for the space of three letters. The first letter is gone; the second is probably an N, the third is either a T or a  $\Gamma$ . The praenomen may be ' $\Lambda \nu \tau$ ., but cannot be  $\Lambda \nu \rho$ .

['Αντ?] Πωλλίων παντοπώλης αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ γυναικὶ Αὐρ.
'Αμμία Ζηνοδότου καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτοῦ κατεσκεύασεν ζῶν τὸ ἡμῶον · εἰ δέ τις ἔτερον ἐπισενένκη τινὰ ἔστε αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.
ἔτους τμ', μη(νὸς) θ', κ'.

Date 256 A. D.

J. R. S. STERRETT.